		·	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
2			
3		X	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	A, : CR-03-929	
5	-against-	United States Courthouse	
6	JOSEPH MASSINO,	: Brooklyn, New York	
	PATRICK DeFILIPPO,		
7	EMANUEL GUARAGNA, JOHN SPIRITO,	e i att William of Marie (Miles).	
8	ANTHONY FRASCONE, ANTHONY SIANO,	gradien terevieren generalieren de etablisaria.	
9	RUSSELL TRUCCO,	e de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la co	
10	Defendants.		1
11		: April 2, 2004 2:00 o'clock p.m.	
12		X	
	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE		
-13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
14	APPEARANCES:	•	
15			
16	For the Plaintiff:	ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF United States Attorney	
17		BY: GREG ANDRES, MITRA HORMOZI, NICK BOURTIN, and ROBERT HENOCH	
18		Assistant United States Attorneys	
		225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201	
19	For the Defendant:	DAVID BREITBART, ESQ.	
20		GLORIA EDWARDS, ESQ. For J. Massino	
21			
22		RICHARD LEVITT, ESQ. JEAN BARRETT, ESQ.	
23		For P. DeFilippo	
24		MURRAY RICHMOND, ESQ. For J. Spirito	
25		MICHAEL BACHRACH, ESQ. For A. Frascone	

		······································
		2
1		HAROLD FAHRINGER, ESQ. For A. Siano
2		JOHN IANNUZZI, ESQ. For R. Trucco
4		
5	Court Reporter:	Henry R. Shapirost, Ambertus and Ambertus 225 Cadman Plaza East
6		Brooklyn, New York 718-260-2509
7		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
8	Proceedings recorded by produced by CAT.	mechanical stenography, transcript
9		
10		
11	The State of the S	
12		•
13	a second	
14	THE CLERK: Uni	ited States versus Massino, et al.
15	THE COURT: Thi	is is 03-CR:929.
16	ANDRES: G1	reg Andres, Nick Bourtin, Mitra
17	Hormozi, and Robert Henc	och Missassinen i satt strent i die eit.
18	elda e a a MS. EDWARDS: E	For Mr. Massino, Gloria Edwards and
19	David Breitbart, your Ho	pnor. The market record to the contract the
2.04/	MARK THE COURT: GOO	od afternoom. Mr. Stern, is not here.
21	MR. BREITBART:	He is on one of those litigation
22	trips to Egypt.	subject of apply that is allowed to
23	THE COURT: Pat	rick DeFilippo. Good afternoon.
24	MR. LEVITT: Ri	chard Levitt for Mr. DeFilippo, along
25	with Jean Barrett Lloyd	Epstein.

36

1.0

I suggest where the government maybe seeking to execute my client, it is not unreasonable to interpret a reasonable time before trial to mean now to prove the recognization of THE COURT: "Anything else? and a series of many accessors." takwa Aurani (MR.). ANDRES 1991 Noya Judge 1991 1991 (1994 - 1995) iliku A Was the area, MR. (BOURTIN: Wa No. a stroke and to be seen to be a seen the way the confidence in THE COURT: We also have a motion -- Ishave a motion with to quash. I think we're going to handle that in camera. MR. BOURTIN: Yes, sir. Relabel of THE COURT: I have considered the arguments here and the 10 11 the papers submitted with respect to Mr. DeFilippo's motion and the to take the south2m sfor discovery relevant to the death penalty determination and I'm denying it for the following reasons: 13 Figure 2014 & Figure 2 Mr. Deflilippo, argues that the opportunity to be the correct of the control of the cont provide mitigating evidence to the Department of Justice for the Department of 16 its consideration in determining whether to seek the death was a but ила и, фо 8**17**. penalty creates expanded discovery rights and I do not agree. A with the restriction The Department of Justice, U.S. Attorney's Manual, For it to a surrowal small which the will call "the manual", is cancinternal document for council where a process 20 plause couly in directing procedure; candedoes anot create cany as procedure. were not 21 prights enforceable by law. Such rights include those welating or 22 to discovery. Specifically, "the manual" states that it: "Provides only Department of Justice Guidance. 23 is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any rights substantive or procedural, enforceable at 25

37 1 law by any party in any matter civil or criminal." 2 In "the manual" the Department of Justice does offer defense Counsel, "a reasonable opportunity to present any 3 facts, including any mitigating factors to the United States and 5 Attorney for consideration. "This, however, does not alterathed fact that no right to discovery is created by: "the manual". a compared Thus Mr. DeFilippo's argument for expanded discovery rights and the due to this opportunity to present precertification mitigation - 8 evidence fails. and Trade . 19 4 000 **1:0** 0 warms and The government is not required to turn coveraBrady corporate as - 487 1 1 1 1 **11** 1 | Giglionmaterials at this stage of the proceedings and access and a ockago a skilla e**12**0 Deflilippo argues in his motion the government is required to the last turn over Brady and Giglio materials to the defense so that 13 this lawyers may use such material to prepare theirway at Asadom letter pre-certification mitigation letter to the Department of the country 77.00 - 2011 1 - 2011 **15**-4 Volume 16: Justice. The Courtesfinds, however, that the request of Brady ema in exemple 1.7 hand. Giglio. materials: isopremature 22 . perogrammed can cutated absorbed by National 18: State of the Count the light that we will be supreme . Count the light that we the prosecution may not suppress evidence favorable to the secretical -139 - 19 sawer mass ar 20s defense as to guiltsor punishment we Giglio ematerial powhich we want to a securities 21s requires disclosure of evidence effecting the credibility of eated be $\text{constant} = \text{constant} + 22 \times$ witness who's reliability may be dispositive of guilt or plants. innocence falls within the Brady rule. The transfer of the contract that 23... 24 In U.S. v Coppa, the Second Circuit reversed the 25 ruling of a judge in this district who granted a defense

38

motion ordering that the government disclose immediately all its exculpatory and impeachment material after the indictment was returned in a case but before trial date was set. The A nower 4 - Copper court held the obligation to sturn mover Brady and Giglio and The same in the same of the sa the 6 made at any time after an indictment is preturned. The Court and explain

"As long as a defendant possesses Brady evidence in time for its effective use, the government has not deprived lack has been all of the defendants of due process of law simply because it did not desc produce the evidence sooner. At there is thought a dy violation when the same with the control of the control disclosure of the evidence would have produced a different result at trial. W. dim the result of the results of a committee

8....

13

___16_

17

From the same and ± 1

1 4 4 1 1 1 1 **1 4** 1

Januari Jelat **15**0

30 (00 30 60 61 **18**8

18 1 til 8 1 kg kg **19**73

Anne mail. 20.

21

22

23

24

25

As the obligation to turn sover Brady and Giglio and the solution of the solut evidencedis "independent of a defendant (serequest" / with isothe were government's responsibility to provide any such evidence that the isematerial no later than the time at which the outcome of the trial@would_have_been_different_if_an/earlier_discbosure_had __### been made ... At this time, there is no date set for Mr. 122 / 2011. DeFhilippo's strial and it is not at all:likely that ait will as occur before 2005. It is true that death is can extremely to serious penalty, in fact, the most serious penalty. It is of utmost importance that a defendant eligible for the death penalty have access to exculpatory and impeachment evidence.